Case 09-10101 Doc 159 Filed 01/25/10 Entered 01/25/10 17:06:09 Desc Main

```
Document Page 1 of 13
                                                         1
 1
            IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
            FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF DIVISION
 2
                       EASTERN DIVISION
 3
 4
     EBRO FOODS, INCORPORATED, ) No. 09B10101
     EBRO REAL ESTATE HOLDINGS, LLC) 09B10104
 5
                                    ) Chicago, Illinois
                                     ) November 18, 2009
 6
                                     ) 10:00 a.m.
 7
                       Debtors.
 8
 9
             TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE
                  HONORABLE EUGENE R. WEDOFF
10
11
     APPEARANCES:
12
     MR. FORREST INGRAM,
13
     on behalf of EBRO Foods, Incorporated;
14
     MS. MIRIAM STEIN,
15
     on behalf of the Water Reclamation District;
16
     MR. ROBERT NACHMAN,
17
     on behalf of Bank of America;,
18
     MR. MICHAEL KEATON,
     on behalf of PACA Creditor Harvest Food Group;
19
20
     MS. KATIE GLEASON,
21
     on behalf of the United States Trustee.
2.2
23
2.4
25
```

EBRO Foods, Incorporated, and 1 THE CLERK: 2 EBRO Real Estate Holdings, 09-10101, and 09B10104. 3 MR. INGRAM: Good morning, Your Honor. Forrest Ingram on behalf of the debtors. 4 5 MS. STEIN: Good morning. Miriam Stein on behalf of the Water Reclamation District. 6 7 MR. NACHMAN: Good morning. Robert 8 Nachman, Bank of America, Your Honor. 9 MR. KEATON: Good morning, Your Honor. 10 Mike Keaton on behalf of PACA creditor Harvest Food 11 Group. 12 MS. GLEASON: Katie Gleason on behalf of 13 the United States Trustee. 14 THE COURT: All right. Let's take these 15 matters in the order that they appear on the call. 16 Harvest Food, I was told there was going to be a 17 settlement? 18 MR. INGRAM: Yes, Your Honor. 19 settlement -- we've now exchanged settlement 20 There has also been, as part of that, an documents. 21 adversary filed with the potential consent agreement 22 that would be giving Harvest Foods a valid PACA 23 Trust claim. There are some discussions still 24 concerning the total amount of the claim, and we 25 have that to work out.

As to the other two, Mr. Keaton yesterday -- he had filed the adversary I guess the same day or the day before and so we're still in discussions on that and I would like to have that continued.

MR. KEATON: I have a problem with that, Your Honor. As you recall, we were up on the call two weeks ago for that very purpose, continue for settlement. Now I know that it didn't pop up on one of your calls without having the case move one inch from status to status, so as of yesterday afternoon we had to file our adversary. Because if you recall the last time we were here we said we can either do this, you know, the cheap and fast way because of the fee shifting provision, or we can do this, you know, kind of the proper motion fees way and do the whole adversary and stick the debtor with all the fees.

As of yesterday afternoon at 4:00 o'clock we hadn't heard anything, not a peep from the debtor, so we had to file the adversary. We did that. We started the adversary. I was checking in with my office this morning, and as of this morning at approximately 8:00 o'clock last night we got an offer that was completely unacceptable. I don't

need to burden the court with that, but the bottom line is it's not even close.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what I would suggest is we do one of two things: Either grant the motion the quick and dirty way, grant the motion, direct the debtor to pay. My client is still willing to take the payments over time. That's not the problem. The problem is there is no movement. So we can either grant the motion and force the debtor to address the claim one way or another. Pay us in full, in which case the judgment is not a problem. The loss of trust rights under Crown v. Patterson is not a problem if they can pay us in full. If they cannot pay us in full, then we need the consent judgment route to lock in the trust status of the claim and allow payments over time on the judgment, not the claim.

THE COURT: Well, from what I've heard from Mr. Ingram this morning, you're not going to get an agreed judgment on your motion. Is that right?

MR. INGRAM: Your Honor, not on this particular motion. What I understood was that the PACA Trust required, in order to preserve the PACA Trust rights, a judgment. And we had talked about

that before. And the question was whether or not, based upon a motion to compel, an order approving the motion to compel would be tantamount to a judgment that would satisfy the PACA Trust requirement.

THE COURT: You know, anything that's required to be done by adversary proceeding in bankruptcy can be done by motion with consent of the parties. The Seventh Circuit has made that very clear. So there would be no problem in my treating this motion as an adversary proceeding and entering a judgment order if that was consented to by the debtor. If the debtor doesn't consent, then as Mr. Keaton says, we have to go through the route of an adversary proceeding so that you can get something that's formally a judgment order.

MR. INGRAM: Your Honor, what we consent to, we consent to the 11,000, which was the original amount that was charged for the produce. We consent to the interest that arose on it. We had a question concerning the attorney's fees. We thought that they were excessive. We wanted to negotiate with them concerning the attorney's fees. That's where we were. It was just, you know, that far away from my saying, "I agree to this agreement."

THE COURT: I don't want to get into a discussion of your settlement. That's not my role here. If you wanted to have a settlement conference with a judge, I would appoint another judge.

MR. INGRAM: Sure.

THE COURT: Because I don't want to be influenced by the discussions of the settlement if I have to make a finding of fact. But whatever the reason is for your unwillingness to agree to -- that the plaintiff would like, we are going to have to go ahead with the adversary proceeding.

MR. INGRAM: What I would suggest, Your Honor, is that you pass this motion for a short while, give us an opportunity to talk in the corridor, and come back and --

THE COURT: If you're willing to do that, Mr. Keaton, I'll pass this and let you talk.

MR. KEATON: I'm always willing to talk, Your Honor. But what I would suggest is that we at least bifurcate the issue, perhaps like a Rule 56 standard. He just consented to principal and interest. The fees are the only issue left. If we can just isolate that and kind of address what we can address and leave what we leave for later. But he's just consented to --

That would be fine with me, 1 MR. INGRAM: 2 Your Honor. We can enter an order --3 THE COURT: Well, look, give me a general order on the motion, then, this partial judgment for 4 5 the amount of the principal of the claim and interest and we'll leave open the question of the 6 attorney's fees to be resolved under this motion and 7 we'll have the adversary proceeding dismissed as 8 9 unnecessary. 10 MR. KEATON: That would be ideal, Your 11 Honor. 12 THE COURT: All right. 13 That would be fine. MR. INGRAM: 14 THE COURT: So you can draw up that order 15 and get it to me by Wednesday of next week at 9:30. Okay. So this is draft order to follow, November 25 16 17 at 9:30. 18 THE CLERK: Could we continue it, as 19 well, for the attorney's fees? 20 THE COURT: Yes. It will be on the call 21 So it's draft order to follow, but it will as well. 22 be at the 10:00 o'clock call on the 25th. 23 MR. KEATON: Can I include in that order 24 a date by which the debtor must make payments on at

least the principal and interest portion of the

25

claim?

THE COURT: Well, you're going to be discussing the terms of the order. So, yes, you certainly can. And if you don't reach agreement on this order, talk to me on the 25th at 10:00 o'clock.

MR. KEATON: I will, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, the next motion is debtor's motion to amend an order. My practice is not to order payment of interim fees. I simply allow the interim fees. And the reason for that is that the payment of any administrative claim is going to be discretionary with the debtor. If the debtor believes that there's plenty of funds available to satisfy the administrative claims of the Chapter 11 case, the debtor-in-possession is free to make the determination to pay the claim. But if the debtor-in-possession is concerned about the administrative insolvency of the case, the debtor may choose not to do that. It's the debtor, debtor-in-possession's choice, not my order that ought to be controlling here.

MR. INGRAM: Very good, Your Honor. I was under the misunderstanding that you were doing it based upon the fact that there was a PACA claim on both of them. So if that's not the problem,

1 then --

THE COURT: I routinely strike directions to make payments when I award interim fees.

MR. NACHMAN: For the record, Your Honor, there is no authority to use cash collateral in the real estate case, and everything that could be used to pay the fees would be Bank of America's cash collateral.

THE COURT: That is better addressed to the debtor-in-possession than to me, but you made your point. And it pretty much backs up what I'm saying, the question of whether there are funds available to make a payment of interim fees is a question that I'm not addressing when I allow the fees.

Okay. Next we have the trustee's motion to convert or dismiss.

MS. GLEASON: Yes, Your Honor. We filed a motion to convert or dismiss. It got sent out on notice to all creditors. There has been two responses, one from the bank indicating that they support the motion but are requesting conversion and believe that there are issues and assets here for a Chapter 7 trustee to review.

The debtor filed also a motion.

First off, they're requesting a continuance because they're saying that they are negotiating with the bank as to a possible resolution of the property. It's my understanding from Mr. Nachman that he is not in support of a continuance. Then the debtor does not dispute whether or not there are grounds to convert or dismiss. It then says if it's going to happen, there should be dismissal. They don't see any reason for the case to convert. Obviously, it's an issue of what's in the best interest of creditors.

I will say, Your Honor, my initial impression was that I didn't know what a Chapter 7 trustee would do. But then just yesterday the debtor had filed -- request to file amended adversary complaint against the bank. And I don't know, then, if this isn't something that a trustee could take a look at, an independent trustee, and see if there's any grounds here to pursue it and go forward.

THE COURT: Well, in a sense since I haven't seen this complaint and you have, you would be in a better position to make that determination. If it's your belief, having reviewed the complaint, that there is a potential cause of action against

the bank here that ought to be reviewed by a trustee and if that would be in the best interest of the estate, the only person who will lose out by virtue of there not being any real asset here would be the trustee who has to spend the time to review the matter.

MS. GLEASON: Right, and I guess I just don't have enough basis here. Obviously the debtor believes that there are grounds. I really can't tell you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me tell you,

Mr. Ingram, I think I have to grant the motion. I

have made a determination that the debtor has

effectively no right to possession here, and this is

a case where a right to possession is the basis for

the reorganization. So dismissing or converting the

case is entirely appropriate. If there is some

right to financial recovery, monetary recovery from

the lending bank due to some misconduct that the

bank engaged in, that would be available as an asset

of the estate, but it would not be a reorganization.

So I will take the suggestion that Ms. Gleason has made. I will convert the case to Chapter 7. If there is some merit to the complaint that you drafted, it can be adopted by a Chapter 7

trustee and prosecuted. If the Chapter 7 trustee comes to the conclusion that this is not worth doing, I'm sure that I'll hear about that and we'll wind up with a dismissal in the long term. At least it will have the advantage of a second set of eyes peering over the complaint that you drafted.

MR. INGRAM: Your Honor, the one thing that I just wanted to mention is that my clients have been in contact with the vice-president of the bank and they were telling me that the bank was not opposed to our continuing with the discussions.

THE COURT: If your client is able to negotiate a new lease agreement with the bank and is able to persuade the trustee that that's something that's worth doing, the case can be reconverted.

MR. INGRAM: Okay.

MS. GLEASON: And, Your Honor, I apologize. I realize that I hadn't brought an order, if I can submit a draft order.

THE COURT: Draft order to follow by Wednesday of next week at 9:30.

MS. GLEASON: Thank you.

MR. INGRAM: I take it that we don't need a status hearing.

THE COURT: No. There will be no status.

Case 09-10101 Doc 159 Filed 01/25/10 Entered 01/25/10 17:06:09 Desc Main Document Page 13 of 13 MS. GLEASON: You just want a straight-forward conversion. THE COURT: Yes, exactly. MS. GLEASON: We'll take care of it, Your Honor. MR. INGRAM: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, Your Honor. MR. KEATON: (Which were all the proceedings had in the above-entitled cause, November 18, 2009.) I, BARBARA A. CASEY, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS HAD IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED CAUSE.